

UG1 MicroStrategy Reporting & Performance Subgroup Meeting Minutes

Date: 18 July 2014

Time: 9:45 AM to 11:00 AM

Location: WebEx

Next Meeting Date: 15 Aug 2014

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction
- Resolution to Action Items from Previous Meeting
- MicroStrategy Reporting: (9:45am – 11:00am EST)
 - Finalize Continuation: Review the final language & error data in the error codes descriptions (cont.)
 - IMB “Mis-Read” Reporting Issue
 - eInduction Reporting Integrity
 - Trending Report
 - Open Discussion
- MicroStrategy Performance:
 - Status of ETRs/Upcoming Performance Enhancements
 - MicroStrategy Performance Metrics
 - Next Meeting’s Discussion Items

Meeting Minutes

- Heather Dyer looking for volunteers to pull their seamless and eInduction reports to make sure we are still hitting timeliness and avoiding errors
 - Please turn your names into Arlene by Monday morning so that Heather can begin reporting to IT teams and Pritha
 - Instructions about screenshots to come
 - The more volunteers the better
 - Question: Randy asks what she is looking for specifically
 - Date/time
 - Heather won’t dictate which reports should be pulled, she wants mailers to run the top 5 reports that they typically pull and any error codes that occur when drilling down on the report, but the following are important
 - Mailer Scorecard
 - Seamless Scorecard
 - eInduction Scorecard
 - Full Service Scorecard
 - Randy Randall volunteers to provide some data
 - Randy Randall: please add a comment column to the feedback sheet
 - Steve: Anyone have any reports that instantly come to mind?
 - Randy: since beginning of July I’ve had issues with Scorecard
 - 107 report requests that didn’t complete, which is atypical of scorecards and could be indicative of an issue
 - There was an instance of a 22 minute mailer scorecard, one over 12 minutes

UG1 MicroStrategy Reporting & Performance Subgroup Meeting Minutes

Date: 18 July 2014

Time: 9:45 AM to 11:00 AM

Location: WebEx

Next Meeting Date: 15 Aug 2014

- Sharon: What is the value of this team continue talking about performance as we get better and more consistent performance?
 - Arlene: if mailers are happy with performance, then that feedback is as valuable as negative experience
 - Sharon: while there will always be issues, things seem to be stable. USPS should be able to take ownership of these reports and send out information to
 - Randy: Perhaps we could move the performance conversation to the UG1 call as long as there are no issues that require deep dives
 - Linda: The slowness ebbs and flows. Releases seem to cause instability, but if everything is stable we can go through the help desk
- Heather: If there are no large issues we should hold off monitoring until the releases comes out so we can get the issues escalated, but if there are large issues now we can track those as well. Let's monitor when we will get the most value
- Randy: let's give people time submit feedback, if there isn't any then we will report performance issues in UG1. Perhaps no need to monitor on a bi-weekly process
- Arlene: There are likely significant gains that could be made by paying closer attention to help desk process
- Steve: Few modifications to errors since last week
 - Has anyone had a chance to review the changes? Any final words or errors?
 - Holly: I looked through them and the changes seem very help
 - Pallets or handling units, how is the word "container" being used? Container should be pallet, anything in report that says container it should be (container ID), pallet/tray
 - Summary of the follow-up email:
 - Question: When does container refer to something other than a pallet in the error messages?
 - Answer: when there is a Nesting/Sortation error between Handling Unit and Piece, the "Container ID" is that of the Handling Unit, not the Pallet.
- IMB Misread will misread 1/2000 pieces that are in question
 - Tom: are these misreads showing up as undocumented mail? I get 5-10 pieces
 - Sharon: We need to reduce noise that may not be related to us, we don't want USPS errors to count against our threshold
 - Steve: when the mail owner sees data for someone who they know did not process their mails
 - If we have a misread
 - What's the most noise anyone has ever seen?
 - Sharon: 50 or so
 - Steve recommending that it won't count against mail owner
- Bookends
 - New logic in implemented in August 2014 that says:

UG1 MicroStrategy Reporting & Performance Subgroup Meeting Minutes

Date: 18 July 2014

Time: 9:45 AM to 11:00 AM

Location: WebEx

Next Meeting Date: 15 Aug 2014

- If I see 100 pieces for PPBS and then I see 3 undocumented pieces for a MID that is not for a PPBS MID and then a 100 more pieces for a PPBS MID I'm going to assume those 3 pieces belong PPBS and I'm going to assign them to PPBS
- Postal misread and undocumented noise
 - How does Postal tell the difference between a misread piece and a truly undocumented piece?
 - Tom: we have internal data that makes it easy to spot the difference
 - Steve: you could use that data to appeal if you went over the allotment of misreads
 - Sub-group members don't want USPS caused errors to count against their individual thresholds
 - Causes a lot of work on both mailers and USPS side investigating what caused the errors
 - Two Part Issue
 - Part One: when the mailer sees data for someone that they know did not process the mail
 - Part Two: Mail misread
 - How does USPS tell the difference between a misread piece and an accurately read price that wasn't undocumented?
 - Tom can spot based on the number whether it is that range or not
 - Can use that data as part of the appeal process
 - Any recommendations for postal misreads in reporting?
 - USPS should throw out 50 or less, do not display at mail owner level and do not count against mail owner for any thresholds
 - Tom and Randy agree
- eInduction – Current reporting doesn't work. We found a major flaw for cancelled jobs, shows up as unknown due to duplicate bar codes around cancelled jobs. Jessie has a new version coming out in August
 - Steve: Table until after August?
 - Tom: Yes
 - Duplicate SCANS
 - The SKID goes in and is scanned on one appointment and there is either a shit change or another truck backs in and the SKID gets rescanned
 - Going to write algorithm to not accept SKIDs that are scanned twice within a certain time frame
 - Linda: ALM ID related to this issue? We have seen this issue too and I was not aware of the fix going in August
 - Answer: No, Tom takes it to Kevin and Jessie.
- Steve: Frequency of meeting. What would people think if we switched to monthly? So our next meeting would be August 15th at which time we would look at invoicing reports?
 - We could still ramp up schedule as necessary

UG1 MicroStrategy Reporting & Performance Subgroup Meeting Minutes

Date: 18 July 2014

Time: 9:45 AM to 11:00 AM

Location: WebEx

Next Meeting Date: 15 Aug 2014

- Holly: Invoicing could require higher frequency
 - Cancel meeting on 28th
- Randy: We will move the performance metrics to the UG1 meeting
 - 97% within a minute
 - Dashboard reports take a bit more time, but are at 93%. This is consistent
 - Tracking 76 reports that are being used
 - 4,162 report requests that were made between 30 June and 14 July
 - Mailer Scorecard is the most popular with 72% of all requests
 - 107 mailer scorecards did not complete
 - Mail Preparation Quality Trend Analysis and Mail Preparation Quality Mail Acceptance Verification Report are averaging either 10 minutes or 3 minutes to run
- Trending report
 - Allow mailers to see actual numbers instead of averages
 - Steve: What changes would you like to see?
 - Arlene: Works with 100s of customers, trending report is extremely effective but the user needs the ability to adjust the Y axis, everything ends up too close to zero to read
 - Randy and Steve had same issue
 - Steve had heard that it should be fixed in August
 - Jackie Engelman to look into it
 - Parth confirms automatic adjustment to Y axis
 - Randy: Tom, what about exporting trending data?
 - Someone else brought this up (Tom)
 - Would like to adjust and capture daily values to show incremental increases
 - What would that look like?
 - Columns would be dates
 - Rows are the measurement values
 - What about multiple locations?
 - Would like to choose between showing:
 - All locations,
 - A single location, and
 - Multiple locations
 - If selecting more than one CRID would the export have single worksheet for each CRID and a summary?
 - Would like to see:
 - A summary tab
 - A separate tab for each location behind it
 - Would also look to export only the information being pulled based on the metrics selected

UG1 MicroStrategy Reporting & Performance Subgroup Meeting Minutes

Date: 18 July 2014

Time: 9:45 AM to 11:00 AM

Location: WebEx

Next Meeting Date: 15 Aug 2014

- **Action Item:** sub-group members should review the meeting minutes and provide any additional input on trending reports

Action Item	Owner	Due Date
sub-group members should review the meeting minutes and provide any additional input on trending reports to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Steve Krejcik,• Randy Randall, and• Arlene Zisow	The whole sub-group	15 Aug 2014